

03.01 - 07/25/94 - 00496

(804) 322-4778

50990

18222:BRN:cag

JUL 25 1994

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Attn: Mr. Robert G. Thomson, P.E.
Remedial Project Manager (3HW71)
VA/WV Superfund Federal Facilities Section
Region III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Re: Contract Task Order 252 (CTO-252), Background
Literature Review for Ecological Investigations,
Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia

Dear Mr. Thomson:

Enclosed is a copy of the responses to comments on the Draft background Literature Review for Ecological Investigations for Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Virginia. This report was finalized pursuant to these responses and forwarded to you on July 18, 1994. Please review these responses and provide your concurrence, if acceptable, of this final report by written correspondence.

If you have any questions, please contact Mrs. Brenda R. Norton, P.E. at (804) 322-4778.

Sincerely,

N. M. JOHNSTON, P.E.
Head, Installation Restoration
Section (North)
Environmental Programs Branch
Environmental Quality Division
By direction of the Commander

Enclosure

Blind copy to:
1822 (BRN)
1822 (Admin Record)
18S
ECAREV.BRN

Response to Comments
Background Literature Review For Ecological Investigations
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, Yorktown, Virginia

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Robert Thomson, P.E., Remedial Project Manager

Letter dated June 23, 1994

General Comments

1. The EMAP data was retrieved directly from EMAP-Estuaries Virginia Province database system. The referenced document was not used; however, the information obtained from the database should be the same information provided in this document. The text will be modified to indicate the source of the EMAP data.
2. No response required, see following responses.
3. A figure will be included of the Station and off-site potential background locations. Several of the background locations have been eliminated from the evaluation process. The revised report only will include the recommended background stations including new locations selected in the interim.
4. The telephone and personal interviews conducted for the report will be documented in Appendix A as contact reports. The volume of information that was reviewed for the report precludes including it in the report. It is noted that the majority of the information reviewed was for the York River, which will not be sampled in the background investigation. However, the York River information was included in this report for general information and for future reference. Where applicable, additional summary information will be added to the text.
5. In general, the data reviewed was not from locations that were selected as potential background stations. Typically, potential "healthy" background stations did not have a full complement of water quality, sediment quality, flora, and aquatic fauna to present the whole picture for analysis. The major data gaps in the tidal freshwater creeks and freshwater ponds are aquatic fauna, specifically fish and benthic invertebrates. Therefore, reorganization of the report in this manner would not provide an overall picture of a "healthy" off-site water body. In addition, the data was presented by environmental group (i.e. water quality, sediment quality, flora, aquatic fauna) to provide data from locations where only one of the environmental groups were sampled. This allowed the authors to present data from a location that could be used as representative of a background area, but did not have a full complement of environmental groups sampled. This data could be used to compile a "background station" that would be representative of either a freshwater tidal creek or freshwater pond in the York River basin, but that would be composed of data from several different station locations.

Specific Comments

1. The recommended background stations included in the draft report will be revised based on additional evaluation of data received after the submittal of the draft report. The following water bodies have been eliminated from consideration for background sites: Waller Mill Reservoir, Bigler Mill Pond, Beaverdam Pond, Jones Millpond, Cheatham Lake, Hardwood Mill Pond. The justification for selecting the background stations, including potential ecological constraints (if known), proximity to the Station, impacts from other sources, and a map of each of the water bodies will be included in the final document. However, it should be noted that the ecological constraints and similarities between background stations and on-site stations cannot be completely determined until the onset of the field investigation.
2. The data was included in the Appendix. The report will be modified to emphasize the location of this information.